

Application No. 10/614,217
Response to Final dated October 10, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of May 10, 2006

Atty. Docket No. 2855/97

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 10 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9 and 12-25 are pending in the application. Claim 1-9 and 12-25 are rejected.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1-9 and 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pendray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,119).

The Office Action asserts "that the term 'sensitivity to camber' in claim 1 should be interpreted as Examiner's interpretation recited in previous and this office action." The specification of the application, however, makes it clear that the interpretation put forth in the Office Action is incorrect. Pages 12 through 15 of the specification provide definitions of crown and camber, which are in harmony with accepted definitions of these terms of art.

In particular, page 12 states that crowning "refers to the curvature of the air bearing surfaces from the leading edge to the trailing edge of the slider," and page 13 states that "[c]amber refers to curvature in the slider between lateral sides of the slider body." The discussion on page 14 relating to thermal contraction and expansion of the epoxy further makes it clear that crown and camber refer to the physical profile of the slider and not to the rolling motion of the slider as it flies.

The Office Action further states that the term "sensitivity to camber" and "sensitivity to crowning" "[do] not make any sense." Part of the reason for the confusion is that the Office Action has incorrectly parsed applicant's claims. Applicant's claims refer to "flying height sensitivity to camber in the slider" and "flying height sensitivity to crowning in the slider." It is

Application No. 10/614,217
Response to Final dated October 10, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of May 10, 2006

Atty. Docket No. 2855/97

clear that applicants' claims are referring to how changes in the physical characteristics of the slider affect the flying height of the slider.

In light of the applicant's arguments above, it is clear that the Office Action misconstrues applicant's claims when attempting to read them on the Pendray reference. Pendray does not in any way teach or describe flying height sensitivity due to crown or camber of slider body. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-9 and 12-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

For at least all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: October 10, 2006

By: 

Jeffrey R. Joseph
(Reg. No. 54,204)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110
Direct Line: (408) 975-7994
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501